UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,097	10/23/2003	Alexander E. Vaschillo	13768.462	6556

47973 7590 05/25/2010

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
MACILWINEN, JOHN MOORE JAIN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,097	VASCHILLO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John M. MacIlwinen	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 March 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,10,12-16,18-32,34-36,44,45 and 48-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,10,12-16,18-32,34-36,44,45 and 48-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/10/2010*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/10/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. Applicant's argue that Guck's teachings are require "either permanently altering existing objects or create duplicate objects to function" and thus Guck does not teach "an act of making the message item simultaneously compatible". Guck, however, recites "on-the-fly … conversion" (Guck2, col. 4 lines 17 – 30) and makes no mention of duplicating or permanently altering a file. Guck also teaches utilizing a "single source file" (Guck2, col. 5 lines 19 – 25) and as opposed to teaching duplicating or permanently altering a file as argued by Applicant. Guck teaches a method where a file can be utilized "as if it were available" in "the other formats [a user] may want his document to be available in" (Guck2, col. 7 lines 20 – 21 and line 51).

Applicant's arguments thus are not persuasive.

3. On page 25, Applicant argues that claims 44 and 45 are directed to "computer storage media" and thus statutory subject matter. However, the broadest reasonable interpretation of said media includes transitory propagating signals (as opposed to claims directed to non-transitory media), and thus Applicant's amendments fail to overcome the rejections made under 35 USC 101Continuing on page 25, Applicant request "that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noted". However, the Examiner has not relied upon any Official Notices.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Said claims are directed to "computer storage media". However, the broadest reasonable interpretation of said media includes transitory propagating signals.

Specification

6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter for the reasons given below in the 35 USC 112 written description rejection. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Said claims recite a

message item that is "simultaneously compatible" with a plurality of different message applications.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Said claims recite a message item that is "simultaneously compatible" with a plurality of different message applications. It is unclear the scope Applicant intends to claim with the language "simultaneously compatible"; said lack of clarity is exacerbated by the lack of written description in Applicant's Specification for said subject matter.

11. In order to perform a complete examination, said subject matter has been interpreted broadly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 1 – 7, 9, 18 – 22 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Guck (5,794,039), hereafter Guck1 (where 5,911,776, hereafter Guck2 and 5,848,415, hereafter Guck3, are each incorporated by reference into Guck1).

14. Regarding claim 1, Guck shows in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, the computer system including a processor and a system memory, a method for creating an electronic message that can be stored and accessed with increased efficiency, the method comprising:

an act of the processor creating a message item representing the electronic message in accordance with a message schema, the message item having one or more general properties common to a plurality of different message protocols and common to a plurality of different message applications (Guck1, col. 7 lines 60 – 61; Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 - 25);

an act of the processor assigning a primary type to the message item, the primary type indicating a primary behavior of one or more content portions linked to the message item (Guck2, col. 7 lines 45 - 54);

an act of making the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality (Guck3, col. 4 lines 45 - 44, col. 6 lines 20 - 34, col. 8 lines 2 - 13) of different message protocols by assigning at least one protocol extension to the message item for each of the plurality of different message (Guck2, col. 7 lines 20 – 22, col. 7 lines 45 – 54 and Guck1, col. 6 lines 48 -58) protocols to account for other properties that are not common between the plurality of different message protocols (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 25), each assigned at least one protocol extension adding one or more protocol specific properties from a protocol extension schema corresponding to a specified message protocol (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 – 35, col. 10 lines 59 – 64, Guck3 col. 4 line 39),

selected from among the plurality of different message protocols, to the created message item such that the one or more linked content portions of the message item are compatible with the specified message protocol (Guck3, col. 10 lines 18 - 20); and

an act of making the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality of different message applications by assigning at least one application extension to the message item for each of the plurality of different message applications to account for properties that are not common between the plurality of different message applications, each assigned at least one application extension adding one or more application specific properties from an application extension schema corresponding to a specified message application, selected from among the plurality of different message applications, to the message item such that the one or more linked content portions of the message item are compatible with the specified message application (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 - 35).

15. Regarding claim 2, Guck further shows wherein the act of creating a message item representing the electronic message comprises an act of creating a message item representing the electronic message in accordance with a message schema, the message item having one or more general properties that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and message applications (Guck1, col. 10 lines 48 - 49).

16. Regarding claim 3, Guck further shows wherein the an act of assigning a primary type to the created message item comprises an act of assigning a primary type to the created message item, the primary type being selected from among electronic mail

message, instant message, fax message, voice message, news group posting (Guck1, col. 10 lines 48 - 49).

17. Regarding claim 4, Guck further shows wherein the an act of making the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality of different message protocols by assigning at least one protocol extension to the message item for each of the plurality of different message protocols to account for other properties that are not common between the plurality of different message protocols (Guck2, col. 6 lines 44 – 45, col. 15 lines 14 - 67) comprises an act of assigning one or more protocol extensions to the message item, the one or more protocol extensions being selected from among electronic mail protocol extensions, instant messaging protocol extensions, fax protocol extensions, voice message protocol extensions and, news group posting protocol extensions (Guck3, col. 5 lines 7 - 9, col. 8 lines 3 - 12).

18. Regarding claim 5, Guck further shows wherein the act of making the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality of different message protocols by assigning at least one protocol extension to the message item for each of the plurality of different message protocols to account for other properties that are not common between the plurality of different message protocols comprises an act of assigning a POP3 protocol extension from an electronic mail POP3 extension schema to the message item (Guck3, col. 9 lines 3 – 35, Fig. 1 item 56 and Figs. 7 an d8).

19. Regarding claim 6, Guck further shows wherein the act of making the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality of different message protocols by assigning at least one protocol extension to the message item for

each of the plurality of different message protocols to account for other properties that are not common between the plurality of different message protocols comprises an act of assigning an NNTP protocol extension from the electronic mail NNTP extension schema to the message item (Guck3, col. 2 lines 40 – 45, col. 9 lines 3 – 5, Fig. 1 item 56 and Figs. 7 and 8).

20. Regarding claim 7, Guck further shows wherein the act of making the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality of different message protocols by assigning at least one protocol extension[Is]] to the message item for each of the plurality of different message protocols to account for other properties that are not common between the plurality of different message protocols comprises an act of assigning a community news protocol extension from an electronic mail community news extension schema to the message item (Guck3, col. 2 lines 40 – 45, col. 9 lines 3 – 5, Fig. 1 item 56 and Figs. 7 and 8).

21. Regarding claim 9, Guck further shows wherein the act of making the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality of different message applications by assigning at least one .application extension to the message item for each of the plurality of different message applications to account for other properties that are not common between the plurality of different message applications comprises an act of assigning one or more application extensions to the message item, the one or more application extensions being selected from among electronic mail application extensions, instant messaging application extensions, fax application

extensions, voice message application extensions, and news group posting application extensions (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 - 35).

22. Regarding claim 18, Guck further shows wherein the act of creating a message item representing an electronic message comprises an act of creating a message item including:

a general properties field representing common electronic message properties that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (Guck1, col. 7 lines 58 – 61, col. 10 lines 48 - 50); and

at least one protocol specific property field, the at least one protocol specific property field representing one or more protocol specific message properties that correspond to a specific message protocol, the specific message protocol being selecting from among the plurality of different types of message protocols that have the common electronic message properties represented in the general properties field in common (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 - 27).

23. Regarding claim 19, Guck further shows wherein the at least one protocol specific property field comprises:

a protocol specific property field representing one or more protocol specific message properties that correspond to one of an electronic mail protocol, an instant messaging protocol, a fax protocol, a voice message protocol, or a news group protocol (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 - 35).

24. Regarding claim 20, Guck further shows wherein the act of creating a message item further comprises an act of creating a message item including:

at least one application specific property field, the at least one application specific property field representing one or more application specific electronic message properties that correspond to a specific message application, the specific message application being selecting from among the plurality of different types of message applications that have the common electronic message properties represented in the general properties field in common (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 – 35, Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 25, col. 15 lines 50 – 55).

25. Regarding claim 21, Guck further shows wherein the act of creating a message item representing an electronic message comprises an act of creating a data structure an comprising including:

a general properties field representing common electronic message properties that are common to a plurality of different types of message protocols and a plurality of different types of message applications (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 – 35, Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 25, col. 15 lines 50 – 55); and

at least one application specific property field, the at least one application specific property field representing one or more application specific electronic message properties that correspond to a specific message application, the specific message application being selecting from among the plurality of different types of message applications that have the common electronic message properties represented in the

general properties field in common (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 – 35, Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 25, col. 15 lines 50 – 55).

26. Regarding claim 22, Guck further shows wherein the at least one application specific property field comprises:

an application specific property field representing one or more application specific message properties that correspond to one of an electronic mail application, an instant messaging application, a fax application, a voice message application, or a news group application (Guck2, col. 15 lines 34 - 35, col. 15 lines 40 - 55).

27. Regarding claim 44, Guck further shows a computer program product for use in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, the computer program product for implementing a method for creating an electronic message that can be stored and accessed with increased efficiency, the computer program product comprising one or more storage media having stored thereon computer executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the computer system to perform the following:

create a message item representing the electronic message in accordance with a message schema, the message item having one or more general properties common to a plurality of different message protocols and common to a plurality of different message applications (Guck1, col. 7 lines 60 61, Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 - 25);

assign a primary type to the message item, the primary type indicating a primary behavior of one or more content portions linked to the message item (Guck2, col. 7 lines 45 - 54);

making the message item simultaneously compatible (Guck3, col. 4 lines 35 - 44, col. 6 lines 20 - 34, col. 8 lines 2 - 13) with the plurality of different message protocols by assigning at least one protocol extension to the created message item (Guck2, col. 6 line s42 – 45, col. 7 lines 20 – 22, col. 7 lines 45 – 54), each assigned at least one protocol extension adding one or more protocol specific properties from a protocol extension schema corresponding to a specified message protocol (Guck3, col. 4 line 39), selected from among the plurality of different message protocols (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 - 25), to the created message item such that the one or more linked content portions of the message item are compatible a with the specified message protocol (Guck3, col. 10 lines 18 – 20); and

make the message item simultaneously compatible with the plurality of different message applications by assigning at least one application extension to the message item for each of the plurality of different message applications to account for properties that are not common between the plurality of different message applications, each assigned at least one application extension adding one or more application specific properties from an application extension schema corresponding to a specified message application, selected from among the plurality of different message application, to the message item so as to such that the one or more linked content portions of the message item are compatible promote compatibility between the one or more linked content portions and a with the specified message application (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 - 35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Outlook (Outlook Express EML, Computing.net, December 2002).

30. Regarding claim, Guck shows claim 9.

Guck does not show wherein the act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning an Microsoft.RTM. Outlook.RTM. Express application extension to the created message item.

Outlook shows wherein the act of assigning one or more application extensions to the created message item comprises an act of assigning an Microsoft.RTM. Outlook.RTM. Express application extension to the created message item (pgs. 1 – 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Outlook in order to support a commonly utilized messaging format (Outlook, pgs. 1 – 5).

31. Claims 23, 24, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Luzeski (US 6,404,762 B1), Lee (US 6,212,553 B1) and Kennedy (6,134,582).

32. Regarding claim 23, Guck shows claim 1.

Guck does not show all of: one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure for representing an electronic message, the data structure comprising:

an ID field representing an identifier that identifies the electronic message within an message database;

a primary type field representing a primary message type of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field, the primary message type implying a behavior of the electronic message;

at least one MessageParticipant relationship field representing links to one or more message participants associated with the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field;

at least one MessageContents relationship field representing links to one or more portions of message content corresponding to the electronic message electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Luzeski shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure for representing an electronic message, the data structure comprising:

an ID field representing an identifier that identifies the electronic message within an message database (col. 15 lines 60 – 61 and col. 16 lines 18 - 20);

a primary type field representing a primary message type of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field, the primary message type implying a behavior of the electronic message (col. 15 lines 25 – 31 and col. 16 line

5);

at least one MessageParticipant relationship field representing links to one or more message participants associated with the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (col. 15 lines 65 – 66 and col. 16 line 9);

at least one MessageContents relationship field representing links to one or more portions of message content corresponding to the electronic message electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (col. 16 line 10 and col. 16 lines 64 – 68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Luzeski in order to provide for a simplified messaging environment (Luzeski, col. 4 lines 40 – 50).

Guck in view of Luzeski do not show at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after being submitted for delivery; and

a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Lee shows at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after being submitted for delivery (col. 32 lines 50 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Luzeski with that of Lee in order to ensure that a users sent messages are properly organized and stored.

Guck in view of Luzeski and Lee do not show a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Kennedy shows a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Luzeski and Lee with that of Kennedy in order to better track a messages retrieval status.

33. Regarding claim 24, Guck in view of Luzeski, Lee and Kennedy further show message status field representing the status of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Lee, Fig. 11).

34. Regarding claim 34, Guck shows claim 3.

Guck does not show all of: a primary type field defining a format for representing a primary message type corresponding to an electronic message, the primary message type implying a behavior of the electronic message,

a participants relationship field defining a format for representing links to message participants, the message participants being associated with the electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field,

a contents relationship field defining a format for representing links to one or

more portions of message content, the one or more portions of message content corresponding to the electronic message electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field.

Luzeski shows a primary type field defining a format for representing a primary message type corresponding to an electronic message, the primary message type implying a behavior of the electronic message (col. 15 lines 25 - 31 and col. 16 line 5)

a participants relationship field defining a format for representing links to message participants, the message participants being associated with the electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field (col.15 lines 65 - 66 and col. 16 line 9)

a contents relationship field defining a format for representing links to one or more portions of message content, the one or more portions of message content corresponding to the electronic message electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field (col. 16 line 10 and col. 16 lines 64 – 68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Luzeski in order to provide for a simplified messaging environment (Luzeski, col. 4 lines 40 – 50).

Guck in view of Luzeski do not show at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after

being submitted for delivery; and

a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Lee shows at least one sent message folder relationship field representing links to one or more message folders the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field is to be moved to after being submitted for delivery (col. 32 lines 50 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Luzeski with that of Lee in order to ensure that a users sent messages are properly organized and stored.

Guck in view of Luzeski and Lee do not show a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Kennedy shows a download state field representing a download state of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Luzeski and Lee with that of Kennedy in order to better track a messages retrieval status.

35. Regarding claim 35, Guck in view of Luzeski, Lee and Kennedy further show a message status field defining a format for representing the status of the electronic message having a primary message type defined in accordance with the primary message type format in the primary type field, the message schema including or

referring to a message status schema that defines the format for representing the status of the electronic message (Lee, Fig. 11).

36. Claims 25 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Luzeski, Lee and Kennedy, further in view of Almond (6,112,024) .

37. Regarding claim 25, Guck in view of Luzeski Lee and Kennedy show claim 24, including wherein the message status field is comprised of:

an IsRead field representing an indication of whether or not the electronic message in identified by the identifier represented in the ID field has been marked as read (Lee, Figs. 11 and 14); and

a SendStatus field representing an indication of the send status of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Lee, Fig. 11 and col. 32 lines 50 – 55).

Guck in view of Luzeski, Lee and Kennedy do not show a LastActionTaken field representing an indication of the last action that was taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field;

a LastActionTime field representing the time that the last action indicated in the LastActionTaken field was taken;

a LastActionType field representing the type of that last action taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Almond shows a LastActionTaken field representing an indication of the last action that was taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented

in the ID field;

a LastActionTime field representing the time that the last action indicated in the LastActionTaken field was taken;

a LastActionType field representing the type of that last action taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Fig. 7C).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view Luzeski, Lee and Kennedy with that of Almond in order to better manage document changes, enabling additional document management options (Almond, Abstract, cols. 1 – 2).

38. Regarding claim 36, Guck in view of Luzeski Lee and Kennedy show claim 35, including wherein the message status field is comprised of:

an IsRead field representing an indication of whether or not the electronic message in identified by the identifier represented in the ID field has been marked as read (Lee, Figs. 11 and 14); and

a SendStatus field representing an indication of the send status of the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Lee, Fig. 11 and col. 32 lines 50 – 55).

Guck in view of Luzeski, Lee and Kennedy do not show a LastActionTaken field representing an indication of the last action that was taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field;

a LastActionTime field representing the time that the last action indicated in the LastActionTaken field was taken;

a LastActionType field representing the type of that last action taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field.

Almond shows a LastActionTaken field representing an indication of the last action that was taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field;

a LastActionTime field representing the time that the last action indicated in the LastActionTaken field was taken;

a LastActionType field representing the type of that last action taken on the electronic message identified by the identifier represented in the ID field (Fig. 7C).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view Luzeski, Lee and Kennedy with that of Almond in order to better manage document changes, enabling additional document management options (Almond, Abstract, cols. 1 – 2).

39. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of RFC 2046 (MIME Part Two: Media Types, November 1996).

40. Regarding claim 26, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing a portion of message content, the data structure comprising:

an electronic message relationship field representing a link to an electronic message, the link indicating that the portion of message content is associated with an electronic message (Guck1, col. 7 lines 8 – 30, col. 9 lines 20 – 47 and col. 12 lines 18

– 67); and

a content type field representing a content type corresponding to the portion of message content (Guck2, col. 16 lines 12 – 25).

Guck does not show an order field representing an order value, the order value indicating how the portion of message content is to be ordered with respect to other portions of message content that are also associated with the electronic message; and

a content properties field representing additional properties of the content type represented in the content type field.

RFC 2046 shows an order field representing an order value, the order value indicating how the portion of message content is to be ordered with respect to other portions of message content that are also associated with the electronic message; and

a content properties field representing additional properties of the content type represented in the content type field (5.2.2.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of RFC 2046 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol as well as to follow the practices encouraged by Guck (Guck2, col. 2 lines 60 – 66).

41. Regarding claim 27, Guck in view of RFC 2046 further show wherein the content properties field comprises: an attachment type field representing an attachment type of the portion of message content (RFC 2046, 5.2.2.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of RFC 2046 in order to utilize a

well-known established and standardized protocol as well as to follow the practices encouraged by Guck (Guck2, col. 2 lines 60 – 66).

42. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of RFC 2046 as applied to claims 26 and 37 above, further in view of RFC 2017 (Definition of the URL MIME External-Body Access-Type, October 1996).

43. Regarding claim 28, Guck in view of RFC 2046 show claim 26.

Guck in view of RFC 2046 do not show a MIME URL field representing a link to a MIME path that corresponds to the portion of message content.

RFC 2017 shows a MIME URL field representing a link to a MIME path that corresponds to the portion of message content (pgs. 1 – 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of RFC 2046 with that of RFC 2017 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol.

44. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Chao (US 2004/0128355 A1).

45. Regarding claim 29, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure for representing a message attachment, the data structure comprising:

an electronic message relationship field representing a link to a message item, the link indicating that the message attachment is associated with the message item

(Guck1, col. 7 lines 8 – 30, col. 9 lines 20 – 47 and col. 12 lines 18 - 67);

a type field representing a message type of the electronic message linked to by the link represented in the electronic message link field, the message type implying a behavior of the electronic message (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 25 and col. 15 lines 50 - 55);

and an attachment state field representing the type and behavior of the message attachment (Guck2, col. 16 lines 12 – 25).

Guck does not show an IsPinned field representing the deletion status of the message attachment with respect to the electronic message linked to by the link represented in the electronic message link field; and

an IsTrusted field representing trust information related to the message attachment.

Chao shows an IsPinned field representing the deletion status of the message attachment with respect to the electronic message linked to by the link represented in the electronic message link field ([29]) and

an IsTrusted field representing trust information related to the message attachment ([12, 40-43] and Fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Chao in order to better manage and classify messages (Chao, [11]).

46. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Chao as applied to claims 29 and 40 above, and further in view of RFC 2017.

47. Regarding claim 30, Guck in view of Chao show claim 29.

Guck in view of Chao do not show an attachment source relationship field representing a link to a database item where the message attachment was accessed.

RFC 2017 shows an attachment source relationship field representing a link to a database item where the message attachment was accessed (pg. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Chao with that of RFC 2017 in order to utilize a well-known established and standardized protocol.

48. Regarding claim 31, Guck in view of Chao and RFC 2017 further show a saved from relationship field representing a link to the message attachment (RFC 2017, pg. 1).

49. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of NNTP (S. Barber, January 2002).

50. Regarding claim 32, Guck shows one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a data structure representing a community news folder, the data structure comprising:

a communities last refresh field representing the last time the community dynamic properties of the news group community including the collection of synchronized article IDs represented in the community range field was refreshed

(Guck1, col. 16 lines 8 – 12 and col. 8 lines 35 – 60).

Guck does not show a community range field representing a collection of article ID ranges from a news group community that have been synchronized with community header properties;

a low article ID field representing a low article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field; and

a high article ID field representing a high article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field.

NNTP shows a community range field representing a collection of article ID ranges from a news group community that have been synchronized with community header properties (9.5.1.1);

a low article ID field representing a low article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field (9.1.1.1); and

a high article ID field representing a high article ID included the a collection of synchronized article ID ranges represented in the community range field (9.1.1.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of NNTP in order to utilize a standard protocol for the purpose for which it was designed (that is, use Network News Protocol to process and manage network news).

51. Claims 12 – 16, 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Lewis (US 2003/0109271 A1).

52. Regarding claim 12, Guck shows in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, the computer system including a processor and system memory, a method for supplementing an electronic message, which was created in accordance with a message schema, to make the electronic message compatible with an additional message protocol or an additional message application message extension, the electronic message currently compatible with at least one message protocol and at least one message application, the method comprising (Guck1, Fig. 5E item 113, col. 9 lines 20 – 35, col. 5 lines 40 – 44, Guck3, col. 4 lines 1 – 44, col. 5 lines 5 – 10 and col. 6 lines 20 - 33):

an act of accessing a message item representing the electronic message, the message item having the one or more general properties common to a plurality of different message protocols and common to a plurality of different message applications (Guck1 col. 10 lines 48 – 50, col. 8 lines 2 - 27), the message item also having one or more currently assigned specific properties, the currently assigned specific properties being specific to at least one of a message protocol from among the plurality of message protocols or a message application from among the plurality of message applications (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 - 35);

an act of the processor snapping on data fields from a further assigning a new message extension schema to the message item, the data fields defined in the further message extension schema .having one or more new specific properties that are to be associated with the message item to facilitate compatibility with the additional message protocol or the additional message application (Guck1, col. 9 lines 30 – 33, Guck2 col.

14 lines 22 – 25 and col. 15 lines 64 - 65);

an act of assigning properties such that the message item is simultaneously compatible with the at least one message protocol, the at least one message application, and the additional message protocol or the additional message application (Guck1 col. 6 lines 54 – 58, Guck2, col. 4 lines 14 – 38, col. 7 lines 45 – 54, Guck3 lines 35 - 44);

Guck does not explicitly show all of: an act of retrieving at least one value from the one or more currently assigned specific properties; and

an act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields to make the message item compatible with the additional message protocol or the additional message application.

Lewis shows an act of retrieving at least one value from the one or more currently assigned specific properties; and

an act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields to make the message item compatible with the additional message protocol or the additional message application ([123-127, 139, 161-166]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Lewis in order to improve message storage and retrieval to better handle the wide variety of formats commonly encountered by users (Lewis, [10]).

53. Regarding claim 13, Guck in view of Lewis further show wherein the act of accessing a message item representing the electronic message, the message item

having the one or more general properties common to a plurality of different message protocols and a plurality of different message applications comprises an act of accessing a message item representing the electronic message, the message item having the one or more general properties that are common to the plurality of different message protocols and the plurality of different message applications (Guck2, col. 10 lines 48 - 49.

54. Regarding claim 14, Guck in view of Lewis further show wherein the act of snapping on data fields defined in a further message extension schema to the message item assigning a new message extension to the message item comprises an act of snapping on data fields from a further message extension schema, the new-further message extension schema being selected from among electronic mail protocol extension schemas, instant messaging protocol extension schemas, fax protocol extension schemas, voice message protocol extension schemas and, news group posting protocol extension schemas, electronic mail application extension schemas, instant messaging application extension schemas, fax application extension schemas, voice message application extension schemas, and news group posting application extension schemas (Guck1, col. 5 lines 1 – 25).

55. Regarding claim 15, Guck in view of Lewis further show wherein an act of retrieving at least one value from the one or more existing specific properties comprises on act of retrieving one or more existing specified properties from a message item that represents one of an electronic mail message, a fax message, an instant message, a

voice message, or a news group posting (Guck2, col. 15 lines 14 – 35 and Guck3 col. 8 lines 2 – 13).

56. Regarding claim 16, Guck in view of Lewis further show wherein the act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields new specific properties comprises an act of assigning a value retrieved from one-of-a data field defined in one of an electronic mail message extension schema, a fax message extension schema, an instant message extension schema, a voice message extension schema, or a news group posting extension schema, to a snapped on data field defined in one of an electronic mail message extension schema, a fax message extension schema, an instant message extension schema, a voice message extension schema, or an assigned news group posting extension schema (Guck2, col. 14 line 15 – col. 15 line 67).

57. Regarding claim 45, Guck showscomputer program product for use in a computer system that is network connectable along with one or more other computer systems to a network, the computer program product for implementing a method for supplementing an electronic message, which was created in accordance with a message schema, to make the electronic message compatible with an additional message protocol or an additional message application message extension, the electronic message currently compatible with at least one message protocol and at least one message application, the computer program product comprising one or more storage media having stored thereon computer executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the computer system to perform the following (Guck1

Fig. 5E item 113, col. 5 lines 40 – 44, col. 9 lines 20 – 35, Guck3, col. 4 lines 1 – 44, col. 6 lines 5 - 10, col. 6 lines 20 - 33):

access a message item representing the electronic message, the message item having the one or more general properties common to a plurality of different message protocols and a plurality of different message applications (Guck1, col. 10 lines 48 – 50, col. 8 lines 2 - 27), the message item also having one or more currently assigned specific properties, the currently assigned specific properties being specific to at least one of a message protocol from among the plurality of message protocols or a message application form among a plurality of message applications currently assigned message (Guck1, col. 9 lines 20 - 35);

snap on data fields defined from a further message extension schema to the message item, the data fields defined in the further message extension schema having one or more new specific properties that are to be associated with the message item to facilitate compatibility with the additional message protocol or the additional message application (Guck1, col. 9 lines 30 – 33, Guck2, col. 14 lines 22 – 25 and col. 15 lines 64 - 65);

an act of assigning properties such that the message item is simultaneously compatible with the at least one message protocol, the at least one message application, and the additional message protocol or the additional message application (Guck1 col. 6 lines 54 – 58, Guck2, col. 4 lines 14 – 38, col. 7 lines 45 – 54, Guck3 lines 35 - 44).

Guck does not explicitly show all of: an act of retrieving at least one value from

the one or more currently assigned specific properties; and

an act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields to make the message item compatible with the additional message protocol or the additional message application.

Lewis shows an act of retrieving at least one value from the one or more currently assigned specific properties; and

an act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields to make the message item compatible with the additional message protocol or the additional message application ([123-127, 139, 161-166]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck with that of Lewis in order to improve message storage and retrieval to better handle the wide variety of formats commonly encountered by users (Lewis, [10]).

58. Regarding claim 48, Guck in view of Lewis further show wherein the act of snapping on fields from a further message extension schema to the message item comprise act of (Guck2, col. 7 lines 14 – 42) snapping on (Guck2, col. 14 lines 23 - 25) fields from an instant message (Guck2, col. 15 lines 5 – 10, Guck1, col. 9 lines 1- 30) application extension schema to a message item that is currently compatible with an electronic mail message application (Guck2, col. 15 lines 50 – 65); and

wherein the act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields to make the message item compatible with the additional message protocol or the additional message application comprises an act of (Guck2,

col. 7 lines 14 - 42) assigning the retrieved value to least one data field snapped on from the instant message application extension schema to make the message item compatible with both an instant message application and the electronic mail message application (Guck2, col. 15 lines 27 – 45).

59. Regarding claim 50, Guck in view of Lewis further show wherein the act of snapping on fields from a further message extension schema to the message item comprise act of (Guck2, col. 7 lines 14 - 42) snapping on fields (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 - 25) from one of: a fax protocol schema and a voice message protocol schema to a message item that is currently compatible with an electronic mail message protocol (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 – 26, col. 15 lines 50 - 65); and

wherein the act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields to make the message item compatible with the additional message protocol (Guck2, col. 7 lines 14 – 42) or the additional message application comprises an act of assigning the retrieved value to least one data field snapped (Guck2, col. 14 lines 15 - 26) on from the one of the fax protocol schema and the voice message protocol schema to make the message item compatible with the electronic mail protocol and one of a fax application and a voice message application corresponding to the fax protocol schema and the voice message protocol schema respectively (Guck2, col. 7 lines 37 – 42, col. 8 lines 10 - 35, col. 15 lines 50 – 65).

60. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Lewis and Yost (6,260,050 B1).

61. Regarding claim 49, Guck in view of Lewis show claim 12, including wherein the act of snapping on fields from a further message extension schema to the message item comprise act of (Guck2, col. 7 lines 14 - 42) snapping on fields (Guck2, col. 14 lines 23 - 25) from an electronic mail message application schema as well as a message item that is currently compatible with first electronic mail message application (Guck2, col. 15 lines 50 – 65 and Fig. 1 item 30); and

wherein the act of assigning the retrieved at least one value to at least one of the snapped on data fields to make the message item compatible with the additional message protocol or the additional message application comprises an act of assigning the retrieved value to least one data field snapped on from the electronic mail message application extension schema (Guck2, col. 7 lines 14 - 42).

Guck in view of Lewis do not explicitly show all of: compatibility with both a second electronic mail message application and a first electronic mail message application.

Yost shows show compatibility with both a second electronic mail message application and a first electronic mail message application (col. 4 lines 1 – 15, col. 6 lines 27 – 32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Guck in view of Lewis with that of Yost in order to readily adapt output forms to any type of electronic device, further improving and broadening compatibility (Yost, col. 3 lines 58 – 67).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. MacIlwinen whose telephone number is (571) 272-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 5:00PM EST; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Lee, can be reached at (571) 272 - 3967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John MacIlwinen

(571) 272 – 9686

/Philip C Lee/
Acting Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442